

29 May 1958

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant to DD/I (Administration)

SUBJECT: Employee Suggestion 3148

1. As you might imagine, it has been extremely difficult to evaluate the subject proposal. This is a matter on which the pros and cons are difficult to judge, since they are primarily qualitative in character and since the differences are largely a matter of degree.

2. We are unable to find any regulations which would govern the institution of the procedure suggested nor are we aware of any security regulations which would oppose it. As you know, the quarterly publication, "Studies in Intelligence," does identify the authors of its articles by name. In view of the fact that we are concerned here with classified reports which are distributed to persons with appropriate clearances and need-to-know, it would seem on the surface at least that the security problems are minimal. On the basis of a very limited check, we have not been able to identify any Government agencies which have adopted the practice of naming the producing analysts of classified publications, although the absence of this procedure does not appear to stem from any regulations against it.

3. A review of exit interviews and conversations with a number of supervisors reveals that the lack of individual recognition on research papers has been an element in employee dissatisfaction, although not a decisive one. In general, it is believed that if this suggestion were adopted, it would make a positive contribution to employee morale, although the extent of this gain is obviously impossible to measure. Specifically, the analyst might feel more personal pride in his reports and a greater responsibility for his efforts, and would be gratified by the association of his name with a product which is circulated throughout the intelligence community and other components of the Government. It is also believed that if this proposal were adopted, it might possibly be of some value as a talking point in recruitment.

4. On the negative side of this argument, it is contended that intelligence production is essentially a team effort, that the research analyst has no more right to a byline for his work than a field collector, a translator, a reference librarian, a secretary, or an editor. To some extent, of course, this situation also obtains in the outside

SUBJECT: Employee Suggestion 3148


world in that many books and articles which, in a sense, are team efforts are identified with the author who is essentially responsible for pulling the material together and for its analytic content and its principal conclusions. It is also contended in opposition to this proposal that those who work in the field of intelligence should learn to accept these disadvantages of anonymity.

5. We are unable to say at this time whether we will recommend the adoption of any of the principal elements of this proposal. At this writing, we feel that it does have some merit and perhaps warrants an experiment by this Office on a selective basis to enable us to determine whether the advantages in fact outweigh the disadvantages. We have for some time been identifying the authors of our Current Support Memoranda and this seems to have resulted in a net benefit to morale. These, of course, are primarily "Internal Use Only" reports. If we decide that it is desirable to experiment along the lines of the subject proposal, we will check first with the DD/I, since this obviously is a departure from accepted practice within the Agency. In addition, a check should be made with the Office of Security to obtain a ruling as to the security ramifications.

25X1A9a

  
Deputy Assistant Director  
Research and Reports

Distribution:

Orig. and 1--Addressee  
1--Ch/E  
1--Ch/G  
1--Chief, St/A  
1--OAD/RR (routed to AD/RR & SA/RR)  
OAD/RR/ mhs/8666 (29 May 1958)

25X1A9a